Washington Report

Capitol Contact

Bruce Craig

Heritage Area Legislation

The National Park Service has long recognized that there are many distinctive landscapes, corridors, and places that are deserving of some level of federal technical or financial assistance. But because these areas either lack sufficient national significance or for a variety of other reasons are not considered appropriate or well suited to management as traditional national park units, in the past, without a well-placed congressional sponsor, such areas have had little chance for federal funding and support.

For several years now, the NPS has been exploring the possibility of establishing a new statutory system to assist in the conservation and interpretation of these special places. A "National Heritage Area" could be defined as a place where natural, cultural, and historic resources combine to form a cohesive, nationally-distinctive landscape arising from patterns of human activity shaped by geography. Roger Kennedy, the new Director of the Service, has heartily endorsed the concept, though, until recently, the administration has not openly discussed the proposal with members of Congress.

On June 15, 1993, New York Representative Maurice Hinchey (D-NY and a new member of the House Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands) introduced legislation (HR 2416) based on the concepts envisioned in the proposed NPS heritage partnership program. On September 21, 1993, however, in a hearing before the Senate Public Lands, National Parks, and Forests's Subcommittee on S. 1033 (Senator John Warner's (R-VA) bill to establish the Shenandoah Valley National Battlefields in Virginia) and S. 1341 (Senator Robert Byrd's (D-WV) Wheeling National Heritage Area in West Virginia), the National Park Service discussed the Administration's views on heritage area legislation that the Service expects to see introduced shortly.

The catalyst for the Service's proposal is the plethora of bills introduced in recent years which seek to establish either new national park units or new national heritage corridors. Two such bills—Senator Robert Byrd's Wheeling National Heritage Area legislation (S. 1341) and Senator Ted Kennedy's (D-MA) Essex Heritage Area in Massachusetts (S. 1342)—were introduced the very same day, August 3. These bills, together with Senator Jim Jefford's (R-VT) Lake Champlain Valley and Upper Hudson River Valley Heritage Area Study Act (S. 1327), Senator Patrick Moynihan's (D-NY) Hudson River Artist's National Historical Park (S. 112), and Senator John Warner's Shenandoah Valley National Battlefields Act (S. 1033), are expected to become focal points of debate over whether to establish a new "National Heritage Area" designation.

As introduced by their congressional sponsors, the latter two bills seek to establish full-fledged new national park units. However, the NPS testimony on the Wheeling and Shenandoah bills suggested that Administration officials would like to see these areas and others like them as likely candidates for the proposed new National Heritage Area program, "an alternative approach that would meet the needs of local communities without creating a management and financial burden for the federal government."

During the hearing, Senator Byrd reiterated his enthusiasm for the Wheeling project which he felt "could serve as a model" for future heritage areas. "Rather than depending on long-term federal financial assistance," said Byrd, "the role of the federal government is envisioned as short-term to aid the influx of capital to assist in the development of the interpretive venues." Byrd's proposal is also unique in that it seeks to eventually make the Wheeling Heritage Area self-sustaining.

Senator Warner and Civil War Battlefield preservationists who testified in favor of S. 1033 (Warner's bill provided for the designation of a 1,140-acre "core" for a new national battlefield) expressed some concern over the NPS recommendation not to establish a full-fledged national battlefield park unit in the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia. Wil Green, Executive Director of the Association for the Preservation of Civil War Sites Inc. (APCWS), argued that the NPS position ran contrary to its own Civil War Battlefield Commission's recommendations and failed to provide for the preservation of nationally-significant resources "in perpetuity." John P. Monahan III, President of the Stonewall Brigade Foundation, minced no words when he declared that the NPS proposal for the Valley battlefields "would fail to preserve the endangered battlefields." In testimony submitted to the Committee, National Parks and Conservation Association (NPCA) argued that the NPS Heritage Area proposal should not be used as a vehicle to stop designating new clearly nationally-significant NPS areas merely for fiscal reasons.

While NPCA and other organizations have expressed concern over the new heritage partnership proposal, a National Heritage Area's Coalition has recently been established to advance some form of a national program for heritage areas. Though the coalition has not endorsed representative Hinchey's legislation or the NPS proposal discussed during the recent congressional hearing, there is little disagreement among the preservationists that some form of regional heritage development program funded by the federal government would be beneficial. However, the all-important question relates to the programs' likely funding source. According to some Capitol Hill sources, establishment of a National Heritage Area System faces an uphill battle, especially during this budget-sensitive Congress.

If you would like a copy of any of the bills or testimony discussed above, drop me a note at National Parks and Conservation Association (NPCA), 1776 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Suite 200, Washington, DC 20036.

Viewpoint

Letters

Park Roads and Parkways

Dear Editor:

I am writing concerning the excellent article "Made for Motoring" by Sara Amy Leach in Volume 16, No. 6.

As Ms. Leach notes, the Bronx River Parkway, 13 miles of which are owned by the County of Westchester, was "...the first of its kind"; i.e., the first public, limited access parkway. For that reason, and because of other characteristics including landscape and bridge design and environmental significance, 10 miles of the Westchester section of the Parkway Reservation were listed on the National Register of Historic Places in January 1991.

However, when the Parkway was dedicated in 1925, most Americans drove primarily for pleasure, at speeds that allowed them to enjoy the scenic experience provided by the Reservation. Today, the Parkway functions as a major commutation route, in addition to being "a road through a park," and the average speed is often twice that for which the Parkway was designed.

Are the two functions completely incompatible? **Can** a parkway meet Federal Highway Standards while maintaining its environmental, historical and architectural significance? Westchester

*(**Viewpoint**—continued on page 26)*

*(**Viewpoint**—continued from page 25)*

County is struggling mightily with that dilemma. What we need—and what the stewards of other significant parkways need—is a set of standards specifically designed for **park**ways, not **high**ways. Standards that are legally defensible. Otherwise, I fear we will lose these marvelous early-20th-century resources to a very dubious form of "progress."

Anybody out there want to join a cooperative effort to save the parkways from the "driving force" that threatens them? I understand AASHTO (American Association of Highway and Transportation Officials) is revising its Green (standards) Book for re-release in 1994. If those of us who are desperate for revisions sensitive to cultural values speak from consensus, our voices will be stronger and the 1994 AASHTO standards more likely to meet our needs.

Sincerely,

—Karen Morey Kennedy
Associate Planner
Historic Preservation
Housing & Community Dev. Div.
White Plains, NY

The National Trust for Historic Preservation, with financial assistance from the James A. MacDonald Foundation and technical assistance from the Westchester County Department of Planning and staff of the Connecticut Department of Transportation, is undertaking research on specific issues that should be addressed in developing geometric design guidelines for historic parkways. The results of the research will be presented by a spokesperson of the Surface Transportation Policy Project (STTP) at the next meeting of the AASHTO Task Force on Geometric Design in Texas, November 9, 1993. For further information, call Shelley Mastran at 202-673-4037.

To the Editor:

I think the letter from Karen Morey Kennedy (above) concerning the article "Made for Motoring" is indicative of the widespread concern about loss of park roads and parkways, that were designed with aesthetics and leisure driving as the objective. While, as she suggests, legally binding standards might provide a tool for preservation I suspect the benefactors will be lawyers rather than those who want to preserve and use these roads as originally intended.

A lot of mayhem has been wrought in the name of progress and safety—in this case Standard 12 of the Highway Safety Standards. Fortunately progress has been made in communication between those responsible for highway safety and others concerned with preservation of scenic and "historic roads." It is hard to argue for the somewhat abstract idea of preservation when the other party is arguing with charts, graphs, and statistics on accidents and death. If you are against safety you must be for death because any breach of safety standards could be lethal, so the faulted logic goes.

We have worked successfully with the Federal Highway Administration's Direct Federal Offices in resolving the inherent conflicts of the two objectives in the preservation of park roads and parkways of the national park system. They care about such matters just as much as we do and have long been our partners. When dealing with road rehabilitation projects on a case-by-case basis it is very difficult to remain totally consistent and impossible to do so between Direct Federal Offices and NPS Regional Offices. Differences frequently develop over the application of safety standards to existing park roads. Safety is not always the issue. The expectations of park users and the type of equipment they tow, haul, or drive causes pressure to improve "roads" as well.

The National Park Service is undertaking a Historic Roads Study to document the development of national park road and parkway planning, design, and construction from the beginning of such work through 1950. While concentrating on the corridor, edge, and associated features, this study will provide the historical context information for National Register of Historic Places Multiple Property Forms. The study also will provide a summary checklist and a methodology for identifying and evaluating historic park roads following National Register criteria. The study will establish guidelines for maintaining significant historic fabric while allowing for contemporary use, upgraded highway standards, and safety. Such information will assist park managers and designers in meeting project schedules while instituting a nationally applicable methodology for rehabilitation and management of historic park roads.

The principle investigator is historian Laura Soulliere Harrison of the National Park Service's Denver Service Center. While the scope of this study is confined to national park roads it may have far-reaching impacts on roads and parkways outside the national park system since it will deal substantively with the early design experiments, failures, and vision of the designers to achieve the effect of "lying lightly on the land" where engineering features that cannot be sublimated are treated as works of art in the "rustic style." This is important because of the tendency to concentrate on the hardware of roadways, (guardrail, bridges, and roadside features) and minimize the importance of location, alignment, vegetation variation, slope transition, and view framing.

In addition to the Historic Roads Study discussed above the Historic American Buildings Survey and the Historic American Engineering Record are actively recording many of the National Parkways and park roads.

As in any art form lay persons enjoy and appreciate the artists expression without knowing quite why. The gift of the artist is to elicit an emotional response. The park road designers were artists in full scale. The object of this study is to rediscover and document the design principles and subtleties of the artistic expressions of these artists who were so successful in eliciting that emotional response.

—James W. Stewart
Assistant Director, Planning
National Park Service

Practicing Anthropology as a Four-field Discipline

Barbara J. Little

If it didn't exist, we'd have to invent it. That's the overwhelming sense one gets from reading recent discussion about the basic make-up of anthropology as a four-field discipline comprised of cultural anthropology, archeology, biological anthropology, and linguistic anthropology. American anthropology has been multidisciplinary since its inception, long before such a strategy was fashionable.

As the study (logos) of humans (anthropos), anthropology is valued for its holistic breadth of field, formalized in the four subfields which are themselves broad. For example, archeology includes not only survey and excavation, but also ethnoarcheology, experimental archeology, modern material culture studies and much more. Ted Birkedal, in a 1991 *CRM* (Vol. 14, No. 5), described an example of ethnoarcheological research among the Nunamiut in Alaska.

An exploratory seminar held in March of 1992 at the School of American Research (SAR) focused on a current crisis in anthropology. Representatives from each of the four subfields discussed the implications of four trends: explosive growth of the field; increasing specialization in research and professional organizations; intellectual isolation of subfields from one another; and the actual or threatened break-up of academic anthropology departments (Brown and Yoffee 1992).

Cultural anthropology in particular is in intellectual flux. E.N. Anderson (1992) notes that, while influence of social theorists from Europe, particularly from France, has tended to turn some anthro-

pologists away from the four-field approach, the best thinkers are broad thinkers. The concurrent irony is that just as American departments are threatening to break up, departments in Britain, including Oxford, are adopting the American approach. The plenary session at the annual meetings of the British Theoretical Archaeology Group (TAG) last winter was entitled, "Archaeology as Anthropology, 30 Years On, Where Next?" In it there was made the explicit case to include archeology in anthropology departments as is done in the United States (Kent 1993).

Biological anthropologists and anthropological archeologists may see a strategic advantage in forming their own academic departments, but any advantage would be overshadowed by a likely diminishing of interdisciplinary vitality. At the SAR conference the question arose whether cultural anthropology would be able to hold together as a discipline, since the centrifugal forces working against it are so strong (Brown and Yoffee 1992).

The theme of the October 1992 issue of the *Anthropology Newsletter* (*AN*) of the American Anthropological Association was "The Four Fields: Myth or Reality." Writers from all of the subfields are quite emphatic and eloquent about the desirability of maintaining a four-field approach. (See, for example, letters from C. Loring Brace, Ward Goodenough, George Spindler, and others in the October 1992 *AN*.) In summary, David Givens and Susan Skomel (1992a) write,

> *American anthropologists still credit the quality of their insights, research and teaching in one field to past and present influences of the remaining three…. The persistent power of 'holism' continues today as American anthropology's essential and coveted reality.*

Its own academic practitioners affirm the value of anthropology's holistic four-field approach that has been practiced in the United States since the 1800s in spite of divisive factors. If a discipline could offer a lesson for the modern world, anthropology's motto could be 'Vigor in diversity':

> *[I]t is singularly the mission of anthropology to teach citizens about the biological, cultural, and historical diversity of humanity, to plead for the dignity of cultural differences, and to insist on an interdisciplinary approach to understanding humanity (Brown and Yoffee 1992).*

What is the relevance of academia's battles to practitioners and professionals outside of an academic setting? Certainly, it is academic departments that teach and train not only future employees at all educational levels but also future teachers. Of more immediate concern, the National Park Service has three new areas of responsibility that are best approached with a holistic anthropology possible through an integrated program. These areas are the Applied Ethnography Program, the Archeological Survey Initiative, and compliance with the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA).

Laura Feller (1992) reminds us that "one of the most important functions of NPS cultural resources management programs is to ensure that management decisionmaking processes are based upon adequate information about the whole spectrum of cultural resource values in parks." Among other programs, the Ethnography Program and the Archeological Survey Initiative are designed to provide such information.

The Applied Ethnography Program is focused on cultural diversity and the traditional use of both natural and cultural resources in parks. There is a need in several regions of the Park Service for careful attention to the needs of traditional users of park lands. In the Rocky Mountain Region, for example, Fred Chapman (1991) notes the results of a renewed activism in the steady increase in Native American interest and participation.

In a discussion of applied ethnography, George Esber (1992) contrasts the applied ethnographer's concern with continuity against a perceived interest by historians, ethnohistorians, and archeologists only in what is past. Unfortunately, such a statement overlooks the long-standing and explicit interest of archeology, as well as the other fields, in cultural continuity as a source of insight into past and present (and future) living cultures. There is no need to attempt to promote one part of the anthropological enterprise at the cost of another; such divisiveness in government and educational institutions is one of the reasons that the parent discipline is in such trouble. In addition to inventorying ethnographic resources, the National Park Service has also initiated a new archeology program to begin a systematic survey for archeological resources. Both the Ethnography Program and the National Archeological Survey Initiative will provide baseline data on cultural resources.

Another new responsibility is the implementation of NAGPRA which will involve anthropologists of all subfields, but primarily archeologists and cultural anthropologists. Frank McManamon (1992) thoroughly describes NAGPRA in a recent issue of *CRM*.

There are two points of compliance with NAGPRA that emphasize the need for a whole anthropology. First, the evidence by which potential lineal descendants, Indian tribes, or Native Hawaiian organizations can show cultural affiliation and request repatriation includes anthropological information such as biological, archeological, linguistic, kinship, and oral tradition; as well as geographic, historic, folklore or other relevant information or expert opinion. The statute requires the inventory and summary of and notification about particular skeletal and cultural items. It also intends the protection of funerary material still within archeological sites. Therefore, as McManamon (1992:10) writes,

> *it is advantageous for federal agencies and Tribes undertaking land-modifying activities on their lands to precede them with careful consultations with traditional users of the land and intensive archeological surveys whenever possible. This will help agencies and Tribes to locate and then avoid unmarked Native American graves, cemeteries, or other places where cultural items might be located.*

In its 90-year history, the American Anthropological Association (AAA), which is the largest professional organization for anthropologists in the world, has consistently affirmed the four-field approach (Givens and Skomel 1992b). The membership of the Society for Applied Anthropology (SAA) also is four-field. Because of its land-management responsibilities, the National Park Service has emphasized the subfield of archeology within the Anthropology Division. The new ethnographic and archeological programs provide an opportunity for practitioners of anthropology to reafffirm the integration of the discipline outside of the academy where the real needs of management, cultural diversity, and research are addressed.

References

Anderson, E.N.

1992 Four Fields in Ecological Anthropology. *Anthropology Newsletter* 33(8):3. (November).

Birkedal, Ted

1991 It's All One Story—A Look at Research in Alaska Today. *CRM* 14(5):28-30.

Brown, Peter J., and Norman Yoffee

1992 Is Fission the Future of Anthropology? *Anthropology Newsletter* 33(7):1,21 (October). Reprinted in *Society for American Archaeology Bulletin* 11(1):12,17 (January/February 1993).

Chapman, Fred

1991 Native Americans and Cultural Resource Management—The View From Wyoming. *CRM* 14(5):19-21.

Esber, George S., Jr.

1992 Applied Ethnography Addresses

*(**Viewpoint**—continued on page 28)*

*(**Viewpoint**—continued from page 27)*

Cultural Diversity. *CRM* 15(7):19-20.

Feller, Laura

1992 Cultural Resources Management in National Parks. *CRM* 15(3):12-13.

Givens, David B., and Susan N. Skomel

1992a The Four Fields: Myth or Reality. *Anthropology Newsletter* 33(7):1,17. (October).

1992b Four Fields in the Triple A. *Anthropology Newsletter* 33(8):1,17. (November).

Kent, Susan

1993 Unit News: Archeology Division. *Anthropology Newsletter* 34(3):6-8. (March).

McManamon, Francis P.

1992 Managing Repatriation: Implementing the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act. *CRM* 15(5):9-12.

Dr. Barbara Little is an anthropologist with a specialty in archeology in the Division of Cultural Resources, National Capital Region, National Park Service. She is developing the National Capital Region's archeological survey plan as part of the servicewide National Archeological Survey Initiative.

Preservation Resources

Reviews

Idealists, Scoundrels, and the Lady: An Insider's View of the Statue of Liberty-Ellis Island Project, by F. Ross Holland. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993. xix +266 p. $39.95.

Reviewed by Barry Mackintosh, Bureau Historian, National Park Service.

Partnerships between the National Park Service and the private sector, the subject of much recent emphasis, are nothing new. The provision of visitor accommodations and services by concessioners was authorized in the 1872 act making Yellowstone the first national park and was aggressively advanced by the Service's founding fathers. A partnership promoted the bureau's birth in 1916: Stephen T. Mather solicited contributions from 17 western railroads for *The National Parks Portfolio*, a lavish publication sent to congressmen and influential citizens to win support for the legislation creating the NPS. Among notable philanthropic partners, the Rockefeller and Mellon families have donated millions over the years for park lands and improvements.

Notwithstanding these precedents, the Statue of Liberty-Ellis Island project of the last decade marked the first substantial use of private money to restore major properties in NPS custody. *Idealists, Scoundrels, and the Lady* is Ross Holland's first-hand account of this pioneering partnership. Holland, a former NPS historian and associate director for cultural resources management, retired in 1983 to become director of restoration and preservation for the Statue of Liberty-Ellis Island Foundation. While there he kept a taped diary, which with key documents and personal interviews formed the basis for his book.

The foundation was one of several bodies collaborating with the Service to plan, finance, and execute the massive job of restoring the badly deteriorated Statue of Liberty for its centennial in 1986. Related projects included redevelopment of the rest of Liberty Island, restoration of the derelict main building on Ellis Island, and new museums on the two islands interpreting the history of the statue and American immigration. Given the complexities of the resources and the tasks, the mandate to complete work on the statue in time for a four-day extravaganza centered on July 4, 1986, and the differing views of the disparate parties involved, it is not surprising that all did not go smoothly.

A French-American committee responsible for design work foundered, as did a corporation licensed to sell commemorative objects made from discarded parts of the statue. Lee Iacocca lost favor with the Reagan administration and was dismissed as chairman of the commission planning the centennial celebration. A congressional committee and the General Accounting Office investigated alleged improprieties within and between the foundation and the NPS. Architects, corporate representatives, politicos, fundraisers, and bureaucrats bickered. Amid all the acrimony, Holland's scoundrels seemed destined to prevail over his idealists.

Yet the foundation ultimately managed to raise more than $350 million, and the resulting work was deservedly acclaimed. "Since the project accomplished its mission and the statue's virtue was not injured," Holland concludes, "the public-private cooperation, as reflected in this project, has to be listed in the success column, and it could work in another project, if the mistakes of this project are guarded against and the lessons learned are taken to heart." Those considering future private-sector partnerships of anything approaching this scale would do well to read his book and heed his advice.

Landmark American Bridges, by Eric DeLony. American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE), 1993. I-VIII + 150, Bibliography, Index, 128 illustrations.

Reviewed by Richard Sanders Allen, research consultant in Lewiston, ID, and 1992 ASCE History and Heritage Award recipient.

Most Americans are apathetic about bridges and simply cross them as they come to them. There is a great lack of awareness concerning these utilitarian, but highly interesting structures. Yet, be it a simple stone arch or an immense and soaring span of steel, there is something about a bridge—its conquering of a barrier—that attracts the eye and lifts the spirit.

For aid in the enjoyment of seeing and knowing about bridges, one is bound to get vicarious pleasure in reading and perusing Eric DeLony's *Landmark American Bridges*, a recent publication of the American Society of Civil Engineers.

As chief of the National Park Service's HAER (Historic American Engineering Record), DeLony has been locating, listing, drawing, photographing and championing historic American bridge design and construction for two decades. As one of the nation's leading "pontists," he is, if anything, over-qualified to select and describe the true landmark bridges of America. With this volume he has done just that, and more.

The book's chronological coverage extends from the twin-arch stone Choate Bridge of colonial Massachusetts to the great modern suspension spans of New York and San Francisco. In between will be found a progression of bridges of wood, iron, steel, and concrete, with samplings of fixed, lift, swing, and bascule spans.

Pictured and described are bridges ranging from the obviously well-known (Brooklyn, Golden Gate), to the previously obscure (Stewartstown and

Oldest suspension bridge in U.S. designed by John A. Roebling, engineer for the Brooklyn Bridge, New York.